

Applicant: EBERLE *et al.*
Serial No: 10/072,898
Filing Date: February 12, 2002
Page: 13 of 18

REMARKS

In response to the Non-Final Office Action mailed November 28, 2007 (hereinafter "Office Action"), claim 27 has been amended. No claims have been cancelled or newly added. Therefore, claims 27-38, 40-51, 54-65, and 67-78 are pending. Support for the instant amendments is provided throughout the as-filed Specification. Thus, no new matter has been added. In view of the foregoing amendments and following comments, allowance of all the claims pending in the application is respectfully requested.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Applicants thank the Examiner for considering the references cited in the Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement filed on August 1, 2007, as evidenced by the signed and initialed copy of the PTO-1449 Form returned with the Office Action.

Applicants are electronically submitting a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement on even date, and respectfully request that the Examiner consider the cited references and provide a signed copy of the Form PTO-1449 for this submission with the next Office Action.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

Claim 27 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as *allegedly* being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention [Office Action, pg. 2, ¶2]. Applicants have amended

Applicant: EBERLE *et al.*
Serial No: 10/072,898
Filing Date: February 12, 2002
Page: 14 of 18

independent claim 27 to ensure that "subscriber" is used consistently throughout. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is earnestly sought.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter. The Examiner has indicated that claims 50-51 and 77-78 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims [Office Action, pg. 13, ¶'s 6-7].

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 27-38, 40-49, 54-65, and 67-76¹ stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,226,360 to Goldberg *et al.* ("Goldberg"), and U.S. Patent No. 6,269,151 to Hanson [Office Action, pg. 2, ¶4]. Applicants traverse this rejection for at least the reason that neither Goldberg nor Hanson discloses each of the features of *at least* independent claims 27 and 54.

In particular, independent claims 27 recites, *inter alia*, the features of:

service subscription means for enabling at least one subscriber to subscribe to at least one service that can output personalized information, and for enabling the at least one user to specify preferences for the content and presentation of service output information, as well as delivery parameters for receiving service output information, the delivery

¹ The Office Action includes alleged rejections of claim 39 [Office Action, pg. 5], claims 52-53 [Office Action, pgs. 7-8], and claim 66 [Office Action, pg. 11], despite the fact that these claims were cancelled (without prejudice or disclaimer) in the "Response to Non-Final Office Action" submitted by Applicants on August 1, 2007.

Applicant: EBERLE *et al.*
Serial No: 10/072,898
Filing Date: February 12, 2002
Page: 15 of 18

parameters including at least one device to which service output information is to be delivered, and delivery instructions based on a detected recipient;

service processing means for processing the least one service to generate service output information personalized for the at least one subscriber;

Independent claim 54 similarly recites:

enabling at least one subscriber to subscribe to at least one service that can output personalized information, and to specify preferences for the content and presentation of service output information, as well as delivery parameters for receiving service output information, the delivery parameters including at least one device to which service output information is to be delivered, and delivery instructions based on a detected recipient;

processing the at least one service to generate service output information personalized for the at least one subscriber;

Neither Goldberg nor Hanson appear to disclose the foregoing features associated with subscription, nor do they appear to disclose processing at least one service to generate service output information personalized for the at least one subscriber.

A. Goldberg.

In the Office Action, the Examiner relies on col. 5, lines 23-51 and col. 8, lines 6-9 of Goldberg for the rejection of each and every pending claim. Neither of these passages, however, disclose enabling a subscriber to subscribe to at least one service that can output personalized information, and to specify preferences for the content and presentation of service output information, as well as delivery parameters. By contrast, the relied-upon

Applicant: EBERLE *et al.*
Serial No: 10/072,898
Filing Date: February 12, 2002
Page: 16 of 18

portions of Goldberg generally appear to describe the ability to modify the playing of a pre-recorded message by a call controller after the call is answered if a prediction by a decision model as to how the call will be answered [e.g., either by a live person or answering machine] was wrong.

Moreover, when discussing independent claims 27 and 54 in the Office Action (at pgs. 3 and 9, respectively), the Examiner fails to point to any citations whatsoever in Goldberg that disclose the recited claim feature of "... processing the least one service to generate service output information personalized for the at least one subscriber." This feature is not disclosed in Goldberg.

For *at least* the foregoing reasons, independent claims 27 and 54 are patentable over Goldberg, and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is improper and should be withdrawn. Dependent claims 28-38, 40-51, 55-65, and 67-78 are allowable because they each depend from an allowable independent claim, as well as for the further features they recite.

B. Hanson.

In the Office Action, the Examiner relies on FIG. 2 and col. 7, lines 11-53 of Hanson for the rejection of each and every pending claim. Neither of these citations to Hanson, however, disclose enabling a subscriber to subscribe to at least one service that can output personalized information, and to specify preferences for the content and presentation of service output information.

Applicant: EBERLE *et al.*
Serial No: 10/072,858
Filing Date: February 12, 2002
Page: 17 of 18

Moreover, when discussing independent claims 27 and 54 in the Office Action (at pgs. 3 and 9, respectively), the Examiner fails to point to any citations whatsoever in Hanson that disclose the recited claim feature of "... processing the least one service to generate service output information personalized for the at least one subscriber." This feature is not disclosed in Hanson.

For at least this reason, independent claims 27 and 54 are patentable over Hanson, and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is improper and should be withdrawn. Dependent claims 28-38, 40-51, 55-65, and 67-78 are allowable because they each depend from an allowable independent claim, as well as for the further features they recite.

Applicant: EBERLE *et al.*
Serial No: 10/072,898
Filing Date: February 12, 2002
Page: 18 of 18

CONCLUSION

Having addressed each of the foregoing rejections, it is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Date: February 28, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Bradford C. Blaise
Registration No. 47,429

Customer No. 00909

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, Virginia 22102
Direct Dial: 703-770-7741
Main: 703-770-7900
Fax: 703-770-7901